COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to Examiner's Office Action mailed on July 21, 2006. At the time Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-10 and 12-27 were pending. By way of the present response Applicant has: 1) canceled no claims; 2) amended no claims; and added no claims. As such, claims 1-10 and 12-27 are now pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims.

35 USC 112 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 and 12-17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants' respectfully submit that these claims are not indefinite.

Claim 1 was rejected for four separate reasons. The first reason (denoted by (a) in the Office Action) claim 1 was rejected was for a perceived inconsistency with the disclosure and the limitation "predicted control word set by the control word changing operation." Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported by the specification in multiple places. For example, paragraph 19 of the application states that "[t]he control word predicator 125 generates or provides a predication of a new control word in response to the control word changing operation as indicated in block 210." Paragraph 30 states "...responsive to the control word changing instruction, a predicted control word

(PCW) is generated as indicated in block 407." Accordingly, this limitation is consistent with the disclosure and is therefore not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The second reason (denoted by (b) in the Office Action) claim 1 was rejected was that it was "not clear" what "other control words" represent and what their significance of matching the actual control word with them. Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported by the specification in multiple places. In one embodiment described by paragraph 29, the stored control words are described as being "the control words that have been most recently used for each table entry or color." In some embodiments, as described in paragraph 22, "the virtual match capability, the ability to match one of a set of stored candidate control words, may allow a small, branch mispredict type penalty to be incurred when a virtual match occurs. Such branch mispredict penalties usually are substantially smaller than the overhead of fully serializing an instruction." See, also, paragraphs 15, 21, and 28. Accordingly, this limitation is consistent with the disclosure and is therefore not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The third reason (denoted by (c) in the Office Action) claim 1 was rejected was that the limitation "predicting control word in response to control word changing operation" was an inaccurate description. Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported by the specification in multiple places. For example, paragraph 19 of the application states that "[t]he control word predicator 125 generates or provides a predication of a new control word in

response to the control word changing operation as indicated in block 210."

Paragraph 30 states "…responsive to the control word changing instruction, a predicted control word (PCW) is generated as indicated in block 407." Accordingly, this limitation is consistent with the disclosure and is therefore not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The fourth reason (denoted by (d) in the Office Action) claim 1 was rejected that it was "not clear whether an actual control word is obtained as the result of the control word changing operation." Applicants respectfully submit that the particular embodiment determines how the actual control word is obtained. For example, in paragraph 30 "a load control word operation (e.g., uOP) is dispatched by the instruction decoder or the microinstruction sequencer is response to the control changing instruction." Regardless, this claim is consistent with the disclosure and is therefore not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 10, 18, and 23 were rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. These claims are also not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, claim 23 was rejected for two additional reasons. The Office Action rejected claim 23 for lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "said control word prediction logic," however, Applicants respectfully submit that proper antecedent basis for this limitation may be found in the limitation of "control word prediction logic to provide a predicted control word in response to said control word changing instruction" in lines 3-4 of the claim. The Office Action also

rejected claim 23 for the limitation "...using said prediction control word" in the last line of the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that in Applicants' copy of the last Office Action response that this limitation reads "using said predicted control word." Applicants apologize if a different version was submitted to the PTO. Accordingly, claim 23 is not indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

COMMENTS

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/22/2007

Thomas C. Webster
Reg. No. 46,154

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300